

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-11 are pending in this application.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Lett at the interview held March 25, 2008 are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-8, 10¹ and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Webb et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,727,135) (Webb). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Webb fails to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited by independent claims 1, 8 and 10. In particular, Webb fails to disclose or suggest a component or method that generates the screen information by obtaining a screen structure on the basis of display specifications of the display component and by applying the claimed setting information to the obtained screen structure, the setting information having been extracted from instruction data that includes the setting information and process information relating to a process performed to document data, as recited by independent claims 1, 8 and 10.

Webb discloses a program that monitors and controls a printer. The program is run on a remote computer to control the printer. Webb discloses that the program creates an exact replica of the control panel of the printer, thus allowing a user familiar with the control panel of the printer to efficiently navigate the menu system on the remote computer. Webb fails to generate screen information by applying the claimed setting information to the screen structure, the setting information including at least a setting item and a setting value for setting execution contents of processes that are to be performed to document data, as recited

¹ The Office Action lists only claims 1, 3-8 and 11 as included in the rejection. However, the Office Action later discusses the rejection of claim 10. Thus, Applicants assume that claim 10 also is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Webb.

by claims 1, 8 and 10. Webb discloses replicating the look and operation of the physical control panel of the printer. Because the physical control panel of Webb is a fixed shape and layout, Webb cannot (and does not need to) generate screen information by applying the claimed setting information to the screen structure. Webb emulates the printer interface. Webb is silent on applying setting information (the setting information including at least a setting item and a setting value for setting execution contents of processes performed on document data) to the obtained screen structure, as recited in claims 1, 8 and 10.

As agreed upon at the personal interview, at least for the reasons discussed above Webb fails to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited by independent claims 1, 8 and 10, and therefore independent claims 1, 8 and 10 are patentable over Webb. Claims 3-7 and 11 depend from claims 1 and 10 respectively, and therefore are patentable over Webb for at least the same reasons, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

JAO:MAC/mem

Date: March 27, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--